

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 05 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 were pending of which Claims 1-3, 8 and 9 were rejected and Claims 4-7 and 10 were objected to. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended and Claim 11 has been added.

The Examiner objected to Claims 4 and 10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 4 has been so amended. Claim 11 has been added including the subject matter from Claim 10, including the subject matter of originally filed Claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 4 and 11 are now in condition for allowance. Moreover, the scope of Claims 4 and 11 has not been narrowed and no new matter has been added in the claims.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 was objected to as containing informalities. In particular, the Examiner stated that it is not clear what shape a translucent lens has or if it is a translucent lens cover with a particular shape. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Claim 1 recites "a light-emitting diode provided with a translucent lens-shaped cover". Applicant submits that it is clear that both the phrase "translucent" and "lens-shaped" modify the "cover". Thus, the translucent cover has a lens-shape. Applicant submits that this term is sufficiently clear as to apprise one of ordinary skill in the art of the shape of the cover.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roe et al. (5,555,161) ("Roe"). Applicant requests reconsideration.

Roe discloses a "panel 12 bearing indicia comprising a series of letters 14", which is illustrated in cross-sectional view in Fig. 2. Col. 2, lines 39-40; col. 2, lines 10-11; and Fig. 2. The panel includes a "substrate 18 bearing a patterned opaque coating which has openings defining a letter 14 and the ring 16" Col. 2, lines 48-51. Roe notes that a "diffusing disc 50 behind the panel 12" may be used. Col. 3, lines 44-45 (emphasis added). Thus, the panel in Roe is illuminated from behind. See, e.g., Fig. 2.

Amended independent Claim 1, recites "a light-emitting panel comprising a front wall, a rear wall situated opposite thereto and an edge between the front wall and the rear wall" and "at least one light input structure for coupling light from the light source into the edge of the light-emitting panel". (Emphasis added). Roe does not teach or suggest illuminating the

panel from the edge. Support for the amendment to Claim 1 is found, e.g., at Fig. 1, paragraph [0031]. No new matter has been added.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Roe. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 2-3 and 8-9 depend from Claim 1 and are, therefore, likewise patentable.

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended and Claim 11 has been added leaving Claims 1-11 pending. For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 1-11. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 982-8202.

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to the fax number 571-273-8300 on the below date.

Michael J. Halbert *2-5-07*
Attorney for Applicant(s) Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Halbert

Michael J. Halbert
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,633

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP
2250 Mission College Blvd.
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210